



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 22.09.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

Nirmaladevi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The State of Tamilnadu, Rep By,
The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Theni District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Habeas Corpus, call for the entire records connected with the detention order in Detention order No.1 of 2025 dated 14.01.2025 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same as illegal



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

and direct the respondents to produce the body or person of the petitioner's husband namely Perumal, aged about 38 years, Son of Karuppiah, now confined at Central Prison, Madurai before this Court and set him at liberty forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Navaneetharaja

For Respondents : Mr.A.Thiruvadikumar,
Addl. Public Prosecutor

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by ***C.V.Karthikeyan, J.***)

The petitioner is the wife of the detenu namely Perumal, Son of Karuppiah, aged about 38 years. The detenu had been detained by the second respondent by his order in Detention Order No.01/2025 dated 14.01.2025, holding him to be a “Sexual Offender” as contemplated under Section 2(ggg) of Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982. The said order is under challenge in this Habeas Corpus Petition.



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondents. We have also perused the records produced by the Detaining Authority.

3. Though several points have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it is stated that the detention order is liable to be quashed on the ground that the detenu has not been furnished with a translated copy of the 'remand extension order' relied on by the Detaining Authority, more particularly at Page No.75 of the booklet Volume-I, in the vernacular language. Hence, it is submitted that the detenu was deprived of making effective representation.

4. On a perusal of the Booklet, it is seen that Page No.75 of the Booklet Volume-I, which is the remand extension order, furnished to the detenu is in English version. The non-furnishing of Tamil Version of the said vital document would deprive the detenu of making effective representation to the authorities against the order of detention.



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. In this context, it is useful to refer to the Judgment of the

Honourable Supreme Court in the case of *Powanammal vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, reported in (1999) 2 SCC 413, wherein the Apex Court, after discussing the safeguards embodied in Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India, observed that the detenu should be afforded an opportunity of making a representation effectively against the detention order and that, the failure to supply every material in the language which can be understood by the detenu, is imperative. The relevant portion of the said decision is extracted hereunder:

"9. However, this Court has maintained a distinction between a document which has been relied upon by the detaining authority in the grounds of detention and a document which finds a mere reference in the grounds of detention. Whereas the non-supply of a copy of the document relied upon in the grounds of detention has been held to be fatal to continued detention, the detenu need not show that any prejudice is caused to him. This is because the non-supply of such a document would amount to denial of the right of being communicated the grounds and of being afforded the opportunity of making an effective representation against the order. But it would not be so where the document merely finds a reference in the order of detention or among the grounds



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

thereof. In such a case, the detenu's complaint of non-supply of document has to be supported by prejudice caused to him in making an effective representation. What applies to a document would equally apply to furnishing a translated copy of the document in the language known to and understood by the detenu, should the document be in a different language.

....

16. For the above reasons, in our view, the nonsupply of the Tamil version of the English document, on the facts and in the circumstances, renders her continued detention illegal. We, therefore, direct that the detenue be set free forthwith unless she is required to be detained in any other case. The appeal is accordingly allowed."

6. We find that the above cited **Powanammal's** case applies in all force to the case on hand. The non-furnishing of Tamil Version of remand extension order to the detenu, has impaired his Constitutional right to make an effective representation against the impugned preventive detention order. To be noted, this constitutional right is ingrained in the form of a safeguard in Clause (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution of India. We, therefore, have no hesitation in quashing the impugned detention order.



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the order of detention in Detention Order No.01/2025 dated 14.01.2025, passed by the second respondent is set aside. The detenu, viz., Perumal, son of Karuppiah, aged about 38 years, is directed to be released forthwith unless his detention is required in connection with any other case.

[C.V.K., J.] [R.V., J.]

22.09.2025

vsm

NCC :Yes/No

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government,
State of Tamilnadu,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 9.
2. The District Collector and District Magistrate,
O/o.The District Collector and District Magistrate,
Theni District.
3. The Superintendent of Prison,
Central Prison,
Madurai District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

vsm

H.C.P.(MD)No.301 of 2025

22.09.2025